APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,673	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-002000US	4263

51206   7590   03/17/2009
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
PATEL, NIRAV B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2435	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/731,673	KARIMISETTY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NIRAV PATEL	2435	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 December 2008 (Amendment)</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-15,17-23,25 and 26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-15,17-23,25 and 26</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on Dec. 03, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25 and 26 are pending. Claims 1-6, 10-15, 17-22, 26 are amended by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook et al (US Patent No. 6,820,082) in view of Lusen et al (US Patent No. 6,999,972) and in view of Karch (US Patent No. 5,899,991).

As per claim 1, Cook teaches:

storing a plurality of electronic records in a common repository of electronic records in the database that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disable by users associated with the database, wherein each electronic record comprises unstructured data stored in a character large-object (CLOB) format in a column of a table of the database [Fig. 4A-4C, 5, 1]; creating a security protocol that protects the plurality of electronic records stored in the database against unauthorized access based on the one or more security rules [col. 8 line 67-col. 9 lines 1-3, col. 5 lines 42-51]; creating a

query designed to identify a set of electronic records stored in the database that meet criteria designed in the query [Fig. 1, col. 4 lines 64-67, col. 5 lines 1-8, 17-35]; prior to executing the query, modifying the query in accordance with the security protocol to create a modified query that includes the reference to a section of unstructured data within the electronic document identified by the user as an element of the one or more security rules [col. 7 lines 61-64, col. 8 lines 46-48]; running the modified query against the unstructured data of the plurality of electronic records stored in the database [Fig. 1, 6].

Cook teaches configuring the rules by a user [col. 5 lines 44-45]. Cook doesn't expressively mention graphical user interface to configure the security rules.

Lusen teaches generating a first graphical user interface and displaying the first graphical user interface on a display device [Fig. 3B, 3c], the first graphical user interface configured to enable users to identify one or more references to section of unstructured data within the plurality of electronic records stored in the database [Fig. 3b, 3c, col. 14 lines 46-63]; receiving information from a user via the first graphical user interface identifying a reference to a section of unstructured data within an electronic record [Fig. 3b, 3c, col. 14 lines 46-63]; generating the one or more security rules in response to the information from the user identifying the reference to a section of unstructured data within the electronic record [Fig. 3b, 3c, col. 14 lines 46-63].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Lusen with Cook to include the graphic user

interface, since one would have been motivated to allow the user to define, configure and manage the document-imaging system [Lusen, col. 14 line 21].

Cook and Lusen teach configuring the security rules above.

Karch teaches the reference to section of unstructured data within the electronic record as an element of the one or more security rules [Fig. 2, col. 5 lines 16-26].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Karch with Cook and Lusen, since one would have been motivated to avoid queries and other system access from entirely overloading the system resources [Karch, col. 3 lines 49-58].

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Lusen teaches:

generating a second graphical user interface and displaying the second graphical user interface on the display device, the second graphical user interface configured to enable users to identify one or more references to sections of unstructured data within the plurality of electronic records stored in the database as elements of an intermediate index that indirectly indexes into one or more of the sections of unstructured data within the plurality of electronic records [Fig. 3c, col. 14 lines 56-65, col. 11 lines 13-28]; receiving information from a user via the second graphical user interface identifying one or more references to sections of unstructured data of the electronic record as indexed elements of the intermediate index and generating the one or more security rules based on the indexed elements of the intermediate index [Fig. 3c, col. 14 lines 56-65, col. 11 lines 13-28].

As per claim 3 and 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Cook teaches:

access to electronic records in the common repository is automatically granted/denied

unless the security protocol restricts/grants such access [Fig. 1, col. 7 lines 8-24]; and

wherein the security protocol comprises a plurality of security rules that restricts/grant

access to the electronic records within the database [Fig. 1, col. 7 lines 8-24]

Karch teaches a plurality of security rules that restrict access to the electronic records

within the database based on the content of on or more section of unstructured data

within the electronic records whose corresponding references are identified as elements

of the plurality of security rules [Fig. 2, col. 5 lines 16-26].

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Cook teaches:

the plurality of electronic records are generated from multiple data sources prior to

committing a database transaction to the database and in response to intercepting data

from the non-committed database transaction [Fig. 1, 4a-4c, 5].

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and Lusen teaches:

one or more fields of an electronic record in the plurality of the electronic records are

filled with XML data based on a predefined mapping to the multiple data sources [col. 4

lines 50-63].

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Cook teaches:

the unstructured data comprises well-formed XML documents stored within the column

of the table stored in the database [Fig. 4a-4c].

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Cook teaches:

allowing a user to enable and disable the security protocol [col. 8 line 67, col. 9 line 1].

As per claim 10, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1.

Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations

that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale

applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 12 and 13, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and they encompass

limitations that are similar to limitations of claims 3 and 4. Thus, it is rejected with the

same rationale applied against claims 3 and 4 above.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations

that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale

applied against claim 5 above.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 6. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 6 above.

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 8. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

As per claim 18, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 20 and 21, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and they encompass limitations that are similar to limitations of claims 3 and 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3 and 4 above.

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 6. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 6 above.

As per claim 25, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 8. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

As per claim 26, it encompasses limitation that are substantially the same as claim 1 and thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 18, 26, which necessitated new ground of rejection. See new ground of rejection above.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beadles et al (US 2003/0154404) – Policy engine for modular generation of policy for a

flat, per-device database

      Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

      A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

      Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nirav Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5936. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

/N. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2435

/Kimyen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435